



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/287,664	04/07/1999	DAVID A. RUSSO	01222.0034-0	6563

22852 7590 06/04/2002

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BRUNSMAN, DAVID M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1755

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2002

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MF-18

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/287,664

Applicant(s)

RUSSO ET AL.

Examiner

David M Brunsman

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1755

The holding of abandonment mailed 18 October 2001 is withdrawn in view of the confusion over the instruction for obtaining an extension of time contained in the office letter of 15 June 2001. Applicant response filed 15 August 2001 has been carefully considered, but not found persuasive.

There has been no adjudicated finding indicating that the subsequent prosecution of the "non-priority" PCT applications PCT/US92/10872 and PCT/US92/10874 would be part of the "prosecution history" with respect to a finding of recapture.

The issue of recapture with respect to the new categories of invention (see MPEP 1412.03) filed with the reissue need not be resolved unless those claims are limited to the particular precursor compositions of the patented claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 28-32 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5028566 in view of US Patent 4308316.

The references relied upon are representative of a large body of art disclosing CVD source solutions comprising metal oxides precursors and accelerants.

Example 4 of 5028566 teaches a CVD source solution comprising TMCTS (a silicon oxide precursor), trimethylphosphite and an oxygen source. The difference between the prior art and the instant claims is the inclusion of a precursor of a metal oxide other than silicon oxide. Claims 4-14 of 4308316 teach formation of CVD precursors including the combination of silicon

Art Unit: 1755

oxide precursors and additional metal oxides precursors including oxide precursors of indium, aluminum and zinc in order to obtain particular properties of the film deposited. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine such a metal oxide precursor with that of silicon oxide in order to obtain such properties.

Claims 28-32 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue, which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

The instant claims are broader on their face than the patented claims in that limitations of the parent claims are not required in these claims. The limitation of the deposition rate in the original application was presented as making the claims allowable as an improvement not available in the prior art. ("The invention is made by CVD rates greater than about 350 angstroms/second"). Compositional limitations were added in response to examiner's rejection of the claims as not enabled for the required deposition rates. Examiner's action specifically stated, "The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a gaseous composition comprising the

Art Unit: 1755

recited tin oxide precursor, silicon oxide precursor and accelerant selected from borates, phosphates and water". The claims were amended to be limited to those specific materials in response to the rejection. The instant claims are not drawn to the same invention as that disclosed as being the invention in the original patent (see the penultimate paragraph of MPEP 1412.01). The specification of the patented application declared that compositions not limited to the recited precursors (as patented) would not be suitable because they would fail to provide the required deposition rate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M Brunsman whose telephone number is 703-308-3454. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 7-5:30, Wed noon-9, Fri 7am-7:30pm, Sat 7-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on 703-308-3823. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9049 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications. All communications related to the merits of this application should be made in writing.

Art Unit: 1755

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

David M Brunzman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1755

DMB
May 24, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'DMB', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.